ISSUE 1

Based upon the current wording of the SOW and the Government's recent response to Question #96, contractor proposals could possibly be considered non-compliant.

Interpretation of the response to the Honeywell "vendor specific components" question is that the contractor still has to provide the "required" Honeywell components as a part of a fully compliant proposal. A contractor would be forced into providing an alternate proposal without providing a basic compliant proposal. The solicitation language is excerpted below:

> ***Specific Component Requirements*--Vendor Specific Components**
> The following vendor specific components are required for the C&I system. Alternates to these systems will be considered when the alternate provides the minimum technical requirements as well as enhanced capabilities. In particular, the Vibration System, T55GA714A Operator Console, T55GA714A Flight Line Test Set, and Oil Temperature Controller are of particular interest for alternates.

However, the following solicitation paragraph requires a fully compliant proposal.

> **IHD 195 - SECTION L PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS (FEB 2000) (NAVSEA/IHD)**
> **GENERAL INFORMATION:** Each offeror must submit an offer/proposal and other written information in strict accordance with these instructions. When evaluating an offeror the Government will consider how well the offeror complied with both the letter and spirit of these instructions. The Government will consider any failure on the part of the offeror to comply with both the letter and the spirit of these instructions to be an indication of the type of conduct it can expect during contract performance. Therefore, the Government encourages offerors to contact the contracting officer by telephone, facsimile transmission, e-mail, or mail in order to request an explanation of any aspect of these instructions. The procurement is being conducted on a best value basis utilizing the tradeoff process. The Government intends to award a single contract as a result of this solicitation.

Therefore, we suggest the following rewrite to the SOW Appendix B paragraph:

> The following vendor specific components, when properly installed and integrated into an otherwise compliant test system, provide the required functionality for the C&I System. Alternate system configurations that provide the same functionality for the C&I System can be proposed and will be considered compliant with the solicitation. Either approach is acceptable and meets the requirement for this program.

The intent of the paragraph is to allow the contractor latitude in proffering a design which meets the requirements for testing the engine. The specific items identified are those which have been used in the past. The fact that Honeywell refuses to quote their particular equipment obviates those as specifics. The proposed paragraph for compliance is approved. (Please see Amendment #6 to the Solicitation.

ISSUE 2: The Honeywell "vendor specific components" list in Appendix B of the SOW also includes a Honeywell T55GA714A FADEC. This item was not addressed in the

Government's answer to Question #96. There is no alternative part to this proprietary Honeywell part. We do not believe this was the Government's intent. Request that the Honeywell T55GA714A FADEC be provided GFE.
FADEC will be GFE

ISSUE 3: In the answer to Question #96, the wording for the engine dress kit items is somewhat confusing. We have included the text below:

> Honeywell T55GA714A Engine dress kit P/N LTCT 31100 All but control and indicating will be furnished under this contract. All other will be GFE (Listing of part numbers for entire dress kit will be furnished on line).

Can the Government provide a specific list of what items will be GFE and what will be required under this contract?
The intent of the paragraph is to allow the contractor latitude in proffering a design which meets the requirements for testing the engine. The items required to be furnished by the contractor include any control or instrumentation feedback to the data acquisition system. All drains and common hardware, to include the bellmouth and other such items, will be GFE.
The engine Dress Kit items will be furnished by CCAD. Items such as transducers should be provided by the contractor. All standard hardware items and the bellmouth, etc., will be GFE

ISSUE 4: According to the drawings provided by the Government for the facility upgrades currently being performed by Anteon, electro-pneumatic control valves will be provided for control of the inlet and outlet water flow of the hydraulic dynamometer. In order to determine if these control valves will provide the stability of control for the dynamometer system, we will need to know the Cv specified for each of the control valves. Please provide the Cv specified for each of the Samson Controls valves provided as part of the facility water brake system.

Supply Valve:
Fluid : Water @ 92ºF
Upstream flow = 400 gpm @ 120 PSIG (surge pressure to 300 PSIG)
Downstream flow = 240 gpm @ 77 PSIG
Cv = 95
1 second closure rate

Return Valve:
Fluid : Water @ 170ºF
Upstream flow = 240 gpm @ 18 PSIG
Downstream flow = 240 gpm @ 2 PSIG
Cv = 70
1 second closure rate

ISSUE 5: This is more of a recommendation rather than a question, but in referring to the drawings provided by the Government for the facility upgrades currently being performed by Anteon, it appears that both the inlet and outlet valves for the water brake

system are specified as "Fail Action Open." In order to provide a safe operating environment, the inlet valve should be "Fail Action Closed" and the outlet valve should be "Fail Action Open." A "Fail Action Open" valve on the inlet supply, in the event of a loss of facility air supply required to control the valve, the valve would open completely putting a full load on the engine. Using a "Fail Action Closed" valve on the inlet and a "Fail Action Open" valve on the outlet provides the best approach to fail safe operation.
Will take under advisement.

ISSUE 6: In reference to Response #52 provided by the Government, it appears that the Government is specifying that the contractor is responsible for procuring the services of the engine OEM (General Electric and Honeywell) to perform the correlation of the test cell. In our experience this would be highly unusual. Is our interpretation correct that the correlation is to be performed by the engine OEMs and funded by the contractor selected for the upgrade of the CCAD test cell?
The correlation will be completed by the contractor teamed with CCAD personnel. No OEM involvement.

ISSUE 7: In reference to the Government's response to Question #70, the Government is now indicating that the "Director of Engine Production has determined that he would, in fact, want to see complete automated test capability" which differs from the guidance provided during the Industry Day conference. Please clarify the requirements for "automated test capability" as indicated in this latest statement.
(a) Does the Government require a complete, closed-loop, automated system capable of performing T700 and T55 engine performance testing in accordance with the DMWR test procedures?
Yes
(b) Will the automated test procedures be used to verify acceptance of the test cell performance or will manual tests be adequate?
The correlation will be completed using manual controls to comply with AED P3417A. The automated test sequencing will be validated as part of certification.

ISSUE 8: (a) Reference SOW Paragraph C3.7.1, "Format shall be consistent with that for existing test cells." Will the Government provide a copy of their existing Calibration Procedure?
CCAD will provide examples of current calibration procedure documentation.
(b) Reference SOW Paragraph C3.7.2. Will the Government provide the calibration standards for the calibration of the test cell?

The calibration standards are as identified in the instrumentation tables within the SOW.